

Mr. Chairman, the Farr Substitute sets a voluntary spending limit of \$600,000 for each two-year election cycle. It also contains related limitations on large donors, political action committees and the use of personal funds. As important, the Farr Substitute provides candidates with direct, tangible public benefits. The 50% reduction in broadcast rates and reduced postal rates proposed in this measure give office seekers a real incentive to voluntarily limit campaign spending.

Mr. Chairman, the Farr Substitute represents the next stage in campaign finance reform. I ask my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to join the gentleman from California and me in sending a resounding message of support for continuing and deepening the reform process by voting in favor of the Farr Substitute.

THE CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 7, 1998

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as Congress moves towards consideration of this year's foreign operations budget, I would like to draw your attention to a highly successful international development program that benefits from federal funding dollars and which operates out of my district in Baltimore: Catholic Relief Services (CRS).

CRS is the official overseas relief and development agency of the Catholic Church in the United States.

CRS assists persons on the basis of need, not creed, race or nationality. Its first mission provided food and shelter for World War II refugees. In the 1960s, while continuing to respond to emergencies, the agency began to look for ways to help the poor overcome poverty, particularly in newly independent and developing countries. Emphasis shifted to the promotion of new farming techniques, loans for small business, and health and water projects. The projects were designed to provide hope and dignity by allowing the poor to determine their own future and rise out of poverty.

As the agency looks to the millennium with programs operating throughout the developing world, peace-building and reconciliation, gender responsive programs, the development and strengthening of civil society are active parts of its work in the promotion of social justice in the countries in which it works.

The policies and programs of the agency reflect a philosophy of working in ways that maximize and optimize the resources, expertise and talent that may be brought to bear on the solution of the problems of the poor and disenfranchised.

CRS has programs focusing on education, emergency assistance, enterprise development, food security, health, human rights, peace-building and reconciliation and welfare.

Long-term solutions to the problems of injustice and underdevelopment are fostered by over 2,000 development and reconstruction projects. These projects promote food security through production, access and utilization; improve health care; develop water/sanitation systems; address deforestation problems; enable poor women to start small businesses;

stabilize the environment; create village banks, and provide vocational/agricultural/health care training. Integration of these strategies in all CRS programs operating in potential conflict areas is a major thrust for the agency.

In the CRS sponsored Small Enterprise Development programs, for example, nearly 90 percent of the entrepreneurs participating in these programs are women.

These programs foster financial independence and sustainable development at the grassroots level. CRS involves the beneficiaries in the operation of the program. Participants manage the loan portfolio and ensure savings are accrued and invested. For most, it is the first chance to participate on an equal footing with men in their societies.

While the obvious beneficiaries of these programs are the women entrepreneurs, beneficiaries also include the next generation. CRS has found that women who participate in the program spend a portion of their earnings on the health and education of their children—needs that otherwise would not have been met. Therefore, for example, girls who would not have attended school are now students. The benefits of literacy as a determinate of good health, income and agricultural productivity have been proven time and time again around the world. The benefits for the women of the future are innumerable.

Another value of this program is the savings generated. CRS has helped entrepreneurs participating in these programs to save an average of more than \$250 per person. In countries where people live on \$1 day, this is the difference between surviving a crop failure, drought or flood or becoming a refugee in search of relief aid.

The Small Enterprise Development program is but one excellent example of the programs sponsored by CRS around the world with the help of our federal funding. I ask my colleagues to please remember CRS, its programs and its dedicated headquarters staff working in my district, when they vote on international development funding in the foreign operations spending bill in September.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, talk about "deja vu all over again." It seems I have been here many times before, speaking out on Campaign Finance Reform. By now, I hope all my colleagues believe that after all the hours of debate in the past several weeks that we have fully explored this issue in the House of Representatives.

My concerns with reforming the system remain as they were the previous times I stated my views. Our campaign financing laws need improvement, but I do not agree with taxpayer

financing of campaigns nor limits on political speech. Increased disclosure will cure many ills in the system; and there are other reforms needed also.

During consideration of Campaign Finance Reform over the past several weeks, I have again to require at least half of a federal candidate's campaign funds come from the state in which he runs. I have voted to make individual's contributions as important as those of political action committees. I have voted to make sure that only citizens vote and that only citizens can make campaign contributions. I have voted to ban soft money in federal campaigns. I have voted for increased and more timely disclosure of campaign contributions. I have voted to ensure that a wealthy candidate cannot use his personal funds to buy an election in a contest with a candidate with limited personal funds. And I have voted against any attempt to limit citizens' right to political speech. None of this is new to my constituents in Southern Arizona; I've made these same points numerous times.

In the final analysis, it is up to the integrity of the candidates and to the vigilance of our citizens to ensure fair and honest elections. No matter how many laws we pass, there is always a weak spot that can be exploited by those who will.

Today, I cast my vote both for the "freshman bill" and for the Doolittle bill because, those two most closely reflect the changes I believe will improve our system. Neither is the total answer, but voting for the Shays-Meehan Bill goes against everything I believe in terms of preserving freedom of political speech. I may not like the fact that groups can "attack" me any more than I like having people burn the flag. But freedom to band together to criticize elected officials is a right that should not be taken away. The Supreme Court has already ruled on where the limits lie and I do not think we need to further limit speech. Nor can the advocates of Shays-Meehan expect the public to take seriously their effort when, in order to keep their coalition intact, they rejected all efforts to include in their reforms the largest single player on the political scene—labor unions.

In retrospect, we should probably look to creating a Commission with the powers given the Military Base Closing Commission. Since Congress has 535 "experts" in running campaigns, it may take something like that to enact reasonable, constitutional reforms.

H.R. 1865, SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS ACT

HON. DAVID E. SKAGGS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 7, 1998

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the action of the House early this morning in passing H.R. 1865, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act.

The bill is cosponsored by my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, and also by our colleague Ms. DEGETTE. I greatly appreciate their support, and in particular all Mr. MCINNIS has done to make it possible for the House to consider the bill today.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Idaho who chairs the Subcommittee and her

ranking Member, Mr. HINCHEY, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Resources, for their help in bringing the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1865 will provide permanent protection for about 18,000 acres of the San Isabel National Forest, including the two volcanic peaks known as the Spanish Peaks.

There are many magnificent peaks in Colorado, of course, but these—the easternmost in the Rocky Mountains—are outstanding. The eastern peak rises to 12,683 feet above sea level, while the summit of the western peak reaches 13,626 feet. The peaks can be seen for more than 75 miles. They were well known to Native Americans and were important landmarks for other early settlers as well as for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

So, it's not surprising that the Spanish Peaks portion of the San Isabel National Forest was included in 1977 on the National Registry of Natural Landmarks.

The area our bill will protect also has other outstanding resources and values, including a spectacular system of over 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These volcanic dikes form remarkable free-standing walls, up to 100 feet thick and 100 feet high, some extending for 14 miles. The area also includes winter range for bighorn mountain sheep and deer, and important habitat for elk, pine marten, and other species.

In all, it is a beautiful and unspoiled part of our Centennial State.

In fact, the State of Colorado has designated the Spanish Peaks as a Natural Area, and the peaks are a popular destination for hunters, horseback riders, and hikers seeking an opportunity to enjoy an unmatched vista of Colorado's mountains and plains.

In the 1970's, the Spanish Peaks were reviewed by the Forest Service in its "RARE II" review of roadless areas, and the Colorado designation considered including a wilderness designation for the area in the statewide national forest wilderness bill that was enacted in 1980. However, at that time there were concerns about the manageability of the area because of a number of non-federal inholdings. So, the 1980 Colorado Wilderness Act instead provided for continued management of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness area.

That same pattern was followed again in the most recent Colorado wilderness bill, which included provisions for long-term management of all the other wilderness study areas in our state's national forests. But while the bill that passed the House in 1992 would have designated Spanish Peaks as wilderness, the Senators still had some lingering questions about the land-ownership pattern in the area. So, once again, the final version of that bill included a requirement for continued interim management of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness study area.

The 1993 bill also required the Forest Service to report about the non-federal inholdings and the likelihood of acquisition of those holdings by the United States with the owners' consent. We got that report in 1995. It indicated the wilderness study area included about 825 acres where the United States owned neither the surface nor the mineral rights, and some 440 acres more where the United States owned the surface but not the minerals.

Since then, United States has acquired most of the inholdings, by purchase from willing sellers—and we have drawn our boundaries so most of the rest are outside the wilderness. So, the way is now clear for Congress to finish the job of protecting this outstanding area as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

That's what this bill do, by adding the Spanish Peaks to the list of areas designated as wilderness by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993. As a result, all the provisions of that Act—including the provisions related to water—would apply to the Spanish Peaks area just as they do to the other areas on that list. Like all the areas now on that list, the Spanish Peaks area covered by this bill is a headwaters area, which for all practical purposes eliminates the possibility of water conflicts. There are no water diversions within the area.

The lands covered by this bill are not only striking for their beauty and value for primitive recreation, but also for their natural values. They fully merit—and need—the protection that will come from the enactment of H.R. 1865. We should all be proud that it has now passed the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give me a "no" vote on the rule before you. The rule is unworthy of a serious national legislature. The Congress has received a balanced consensus budget with a surplus no less from a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, containing only the city's taxpayer-raised funds. Instead of minding its own national business and getting on with the mountain of work left for us to do, this bill has become an excuse for indulging the controversial social and financial whims of some Members of this body. That is unfair to you, it is unfair to me, and it is unfair to District residents. Defeat this rule, unless you are prepared to waste a lot more time in Washington on the smallest appropriation and the one least relevant to your constituents.

I have the Administration's Statement of Policy here. A litany of objections to this bill are listed by the Administration. Among them are three amendments which have been made in order, vouchers, the prohibition on adoption by married couples, and the prohibition on local funds for needle exchange, among others.

This rule reads like a who's who of special interests. It nullifies a modest residency rule that the Control Board supports because the

residency law strengthens the recovering D.C. economy. It puts this body through another vouchers fight not three months after the President has vetoed vouchers. It will make you vote on tricky social issues many Republican and Democratic Members would just as soon avoid.

Two provisions strike at the core of democracy. One gratuitously bars the use of local funds in cooperating with a pro bono voting rights lawsuit that hardly involves the city, anyway. The other defunds the advisory neighborhood commissions that get pittance amounts as elected neighborhood officials who attend to grassroots problems like assuring that parks and river banks do not accumulate trash or harbor crime. At the last minute, a Member got a bright idea, he decided that the District's tobacco prohibitions might be strengthened but did not give me the courtesy of allowing me to ask the City Council to do it themselves.

When you vote on this rule, you will make a statement of where you stand on controversial social issues and where you stand on democracy and devolution. The D.C. appropriation is not the place to take your stand on social legislation. The D.C. appropriation is the place to stand up for democracy. The way to do both is to defeat this rule.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, school vouchers are the original bad idea for the improvement of public education.

We will hear from the other side that the establishment of school vouchers are the best way to reform and improve education.

This is basically what they are saying. If you provide 2,000 children the option to attend other schools, the remaining 75,000 will have their public education magically improved. The argument is like saying that the best way to improve health programs for everyone is to provide options for 3% of the population and by magic, the health care system will improve.

Public schools need our help and our criticism when it is appropriate; what they do not need is to have their resources taken away for programs which can only benefit a few.

We will hear that the main motivation for the establishment of vouchers is to improve the public schools. This is simply not the case. There are people who like school vouchers because they want to take their kids out of public schools, not because they want to improve the schools, but because they do not like public schools.

I don't mind this. If you want to do this, it's OK, but do not do it at the expense of public schools and do not say you are doing it to improve those schools. You are doing it because you don't care about the public schools which